

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 7-8 and 15-18 are presently pending in the applications. Claims 7-8 are amended; Claims 1-6 and 9-14 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer; and new Claims 15-18 are added by the present amendment. Claims 7 and 8 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claims 5 and 6, and to correct matters of form. New Claims 15 and 16 are drafted as apparatus claims corresponding to the subject matter recited in allowed Claims 7 and 8, respectively. Claims 17 and 18 also correspond to amended Claims 7 and 8, respectively, and have been drafted to elicit interpretation under 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph. No new matter is presented.

By way of summary, the Official Action presents the following issues: the specification was objected to because of the spacing of the lines of the specification; Claims 1-4 and 14 were objected to because of minor informalities; Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 11 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Jiyaruko et al. (JP 09-306088, hereinafter “Jiyaruko”); Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 9 and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Fujinawa (JP 08-102140, hereinafter “Fujinawa”); and Claims 7 and 8 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the indication of allowable subject matter. In response, Claims 7 and 8 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of the claims from which they respectively depend. Therefore, Claims 7 and 8 are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record.


In response to the objection of the specification, Applicants have provided a new copy of the specification with adequate line spacing, which is attached hereto. Only the format of the specification has been changed and the title has been amended. Thus, no new matter is presented. A clean copy and a marked-up copy of the specification are provided. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Claims 1-6 and 9-14 are canceled without prejudice and dependent Claims 7 and 8 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of canceled Claims 5 and 6 from which they depend. Therefore, the outstanding prior art rejections and claim objections corresponding Claims 1-6 and 9-14 have been rendered moot. Further, new apparatus Claims 15-18 recite substantially the same subject matter recited in allowed method Claims 7 and 8. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 15-18 also patentably define over the prior art of record and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes any additional formal matter need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Scott A. McKeown
Registration No. 42,866

BDL:SAM:ATH\la

I:\ATTY\ATH\PROSECUTION\21'S\214004US\214004 AM 12-28-04.DOC